



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/635,507	08/09/2000	Krishnaswamy Ramkumar	CYPR-PM00005	5685

7590 03/13/2003

Wagner Murabito & Hao L L P  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, MATTHEW A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/635,507

Applicant(s)

RAMKUMAR ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew A. Anderson

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 36-45 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 29-35 and 46-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 29-30, 32-34, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thei et al. (US 6,350,662 B1) in view of Wolf et al. (Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era Volume 1: Process Technology, Lattice Press, Sunset Beach, CA USA, pp. 218-219, 228, 1986).

Thei et al. discloses a method to reduce defects in shallow trench isolations by post liner anneal. The substrate has reduced defects by a nitrogen anneal. A silicon substrate is provided. Etching is used (RIE which stands for reactive ion etching) on the substrate to form the shallow trenches with corners seen in Fig. 4. A liner silicon oxide layer (LINOX of the applicant's claims) is grown by wet oxidation at between about 800-900 degrees C or by dry oxidation at from about 900-950'C on the interior surfaces of the shallow trenches. The substrate and liner are annealed to reduce or eliminate defects, dislocations, interface traps, and stress in the silicon substrate. This inherently must mean that the stress in the liner oxide are also reduced since the liner is formed

Art Unit: 1765

on the substrate. The anneal takes place in  $N_2$  at a temperature of between about 1000 to 1150 degrees C. (see col. 4 lines 1-10) A silicon oxide isolation layer is then (i.e. subsequently) deposited (i.e. backfilled) by high density plasma low pressure CVD (see col. 4 lines 20-30) over the liner layer and completely filling the shallow trenches. (see abstract for the above). Then, as in col. 4 lines 44-55, after planarization by CMP, polysilicon features are deposited and defined (i.e. etched) by processing steps typical in the art over the isolation structure thus formed. Thei et al. discloses the anneal as a way of reducing defects and breakdown of the isolation. The leakage in a semiconductor device is an inherent result of the breakdown of the oxide isolation. (see col. 1 and 2 lines 60+ and 1-20, respectively) RIE was known to be inherently a plasma process for etching trenches. (see Akatsu et al. US 6,319,794 B1 col. 6 lines 54-60.)

Thei et al. does not specify lowering the temperature after the nitrogen anneal.

Wolf et al. discloses low temperature techniques for forming  $SiO_2$  by CVD page 219. Also, at processing temperatures less than 800°C, stress at corners of  $SiO_2$  is not large enough to cause plastic deformation (i.e. defect formation).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to combine the references and perform the method of claim 29 because Thei et al. gives a process for the formation of shallow trench isolation structures with reduced defects and stress and Wolf et al. suggests using a low temperature method of  $SiO_2$  plasma CVD to fill the trench so as to avoid high process

temperatures and possible formation of defects in the fill step. Motivation is the avoidance and prevention of defects.

In respect to claims 30, 32, 34, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to optimize the oxidation and anneal temperature as well as the length of annealing of the liner oxide layer because Thei et al. suggests a temperature of about 900-950°C for oxidation followed by 1000-1150°C anneal for about 30 to 150 minutes, Thei establishes time and temperature as result effective parameters, and such optimization would have been achieved with only routine experimentation. The anneal was described as repairing any damage done and to reduce stress added to the substrate during the RIE and liner oxide growth step in Col. 4 lines 11-15 and performing this step until the results were achieved was thus obvious.

In respect to claim 33, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use nitrogen as the anneal gas because this is suggested by Thei et al.

In respect to claim 46, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to cool down to the substrate in a shallow trench isolation process directly from the anneal to the trench fill deposition temperature because such would speed processing and avoid additional thermal cycling stress.

4. Claims 31, 35, 47, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thei et al. and Wolf et al., as applied to the above claims in further view of Olsen et al. (US 6,150,234).

Art Unit: 1765

Thei et al and Wolf et al. combined are described above.

Thei et al. combined do not explicitly state that the first gaseous environment contain oxygen and chlorine.

Olsen et al. discloses that an oxidation gas of  $O_2$  and chlorine form the liner layer in a shallow trench isolation process.  $HCl$  or  $C_2H_2Cl_2$  are given as the chlorine supplying gases used. Temperature of  $1075^\circ C$  is used in the oxidation step. The chlorine is disclosed as rounding corners which helps to reduce the device failure rate. (see col. 2 lines 15-20.) Inert gas such as  $N_2$  and  $Ar$  can be added to the gas mix and thus slow the oxidation which in turn causes rounding at the corners. (Col. 3 lines 30-45.)

In respect to claim 31 and 48, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to combine the knowledge of Thei and Wolf with that of Olsen et al. because Olsen et al. add corner rounding to improve the isolation structure achieved. Motivation is given in that the device would then be expected to overcome failure and reliability issues (col. 2 lines 15-20.)

In respect to claim 35 and 47, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to optimize the temperature of the isolation fill step because Wolf et al. discloses  $800^\circ C$  as a point at which stress reaches a critical level, desire to not undo the previous anneal step to reduce stress in the substrate, and because such optimization would have been achieved with only routine experimentation.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection required by the newly added claims 29-48.

The In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., heater in the deposition chamber) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 36-45 are allowed.
5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Thei et al. nor Olsen et al. do not suggest the use of the three step ramp up liner oxide deposition/anneal followed by a temperature decrease/shallow trench isolation fill with different gas chemistries at the different steps.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

Art Unit: 1765

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew A. Anderson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0086. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 6:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin Utech can be reached on (703) 308-3836. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



ROBERT KUNEMUND  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

MAA  
March 10, 2003